

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF HEARING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2003**

City Hall Council Chambers
210 East 13th Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the City Hall Council Chambers, 210 East 13th Street, Vancouver, Washington.

Members Present: Vaughn Lein, Chair; Lonnie Moss, Jada Rupley, Dick Deleissegues, Ron Barca, and Carey Smith.

Members Absent: Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair.

Staff Present: Steven Schulte, Transportation Program Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager; Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for February 20, 2003

The agenda was approved as distributed.

B. Approval of Minutes of November 21, 2002

It was **MOVED** by Dick Deleissegues and **Seconded** by Ron Barca to **APPROVE** the Minutes of November 21, 2002. **MOTION WAS APPROVED** by unanimous voice vote of all members present.

C. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. Salmon Creek Avenue Concurrency Corridor – Concurrency Travel Speed Standard Reduction and Related Changes:

Clark County is considering reducing the Concurrency travel speed standard or level-of-service standard for the Salmon Creek Avenue Concurrency corridor. This corridor extends from the Interstate 5 interchange with NE 134th Street to the intersection of Salmon Creek Avenue and NE 50th Avenue. The current Concurrency standard for this corridor is 22 mph during the PM peak traffic hour. Proposed changes would include modifications to the County's Concurrency Ordinance, the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, and the County's Capital Facilities Plan and Arterial Atlas in the Salmon Creek area.

**Staff: Steve Schulte, (360) 397-6118 extension 4017 or
Evan Dust, (360) 397-2375 extension 4913**

DUST: Good evening. For the record my name is Evan Dust, I'm a Program Manager II in Long-Range Planning, and we're before you tonight with measures to resolve the Salmon Creek moratorium. The presentation consists of a brief introduction, walking through the proposed solution and staff recommendation.

Clark County adopted a program of concurrency for transportation corridors based on a time or a travel speed in October of 2000 with 34 corridors. The level-of-service standards were set from a high of 27 miles per hour to a low of 13 miles per hour with steps at 22 and 17 miles per hour. These correspond to a Highway Capacity Manual level-of-service C for Type 1 urban arterials and a level-of-service E for Type 2 urban arterials. The standards for each corridor are based on our affordable list of transportation improvements. All the corridors have been performing at or above their concurrency standard since adoption of the new program with one significant exception, that's the Salmon Creek west central corridor. That corridor runs from the northbound off-ramp of I-5 to 134th Street through the intersections with Highway 99, NE 20th Avenue and the I-205 interchange complex to its easternmost terminus at NE 50th Avenue.

The corridor has been in extended concurrency failure with no near-term prospects for roadway improvements that would increase travel speeds. The adopted standard is 22 miles per hour. The current projected operating level-of-service is 20 miles per hour. The extended nature of the failure caused the Board of County Commissioners to enact a development moratorium in December of 2001. That moratorium will end on April 1st, 2003, at the latest if the actions proposed by staff are eventually enacted by the Board.

Since declaration of the moratorium, staff has diligently been looking for both the causes and the solution to this issue. Staff believes that the problem results from three causes. The original standards for the corridor were developed with a spreadsheet tool that tried to take regional travel volumes, intersection timing and produce delay in the corridor, how long an average vehicle would get stopped as it tried to make through, its way through the corridor. At the time that it was developed it was the state-of-the-art.

It has worked successfully in predicting level-of-service for 33 of the 34 corridors. However, now macro and micro simulations of corridor delay surpass it in terms of predictive capability. Those simulations for this corridor indicate that a lower level-of-service would have been picked if we had that tool available at the time. The 22 mile per hour standard was based on the 2020 horizon traffic condition. All the generalized land use in the corridor was assumed to be developed. All the affordable level-of-service and affordable transportation improvements were assumed to be in place, including historic State spending on capital projects. It was recognized that in the interim years, those intervening years, between the base year and the horizon year that there would be fluctuation in the operating levels of corridors and that certain corridors would fall into failure depending on the timing of development and roadway improvements, but it was not expected that we would reach this protracted failure as has occurred with the Salmon Creek corridor.

And, third, generalized land use cannot address specific site impacts. It can account for those unique trip generators that are hard to predict where the land in the community, for example, when the level-of-service was set for this corridor in 2000 there was not a Legacy Hospital proposed near the NE 134th Street, NE 20th Avenue intersection.

Solutions are limited because of the nature of the corridor. The County only controls the timing of its improvements, not those to the State highway system. Staff examined and found that there were no improvements that the County could make within the constraints of the affordable capital facilities plan that would return and maintain the 22 mile per hour level-of-service standard for this corridor. Since we can't do it alone, the County is approaching this problem with a combination of actions and assumptions. We propose to amend the plans for improvements in this area. We trust that the State will deliver on interchange improvements to I-5 and 134th, plus we propose lowering the level-of-service standard. A listing of those specific actions that we're presenting tonight are found on Page 2 of the staff report and they're summarized as a series of bullets on this slide.

One, to amend the arterial atlas to add NE 139th Street as a five-lane minor arterial facility, add 139th Street to the transportation capital facilities plan, and to amend the concurrency standard for the corridor. All three actions are needed together to be able to lift the moratorium. The arterial atlas amendment was analyzed based on the evaluation criteria that you as Planning Commissioners have seen several times before. They are summarized on Page 2 of the staff report. Page 3 of the staff report, Figure 1, shows the proposed amendment as it would look in the arterial atlas zoomed into this specific area of the amendment. That figure is reproduced in this slide. Essentially the gray line that you see on this slide that's highlighted with the arrows, the red arrows, indicates the extent of the additional designation to be added to the arterial atlas.

This amendment is not without issues. A five-lane section on 139th doesn't do much more than a three-lane section. But there's a heightened risk in this prediction, we're in the midst of a comprehensive plan review process. The land use inputs that were used to generate the traffic volumes on that five lane and three-lane section may change as the comprehensive plan is amended. Given that the County Engineer has

the ability to drop lanes from a planned facility without further amendment of the atlas, staff recommendation is to pursue the designation of a five-lane section, that way the risk is covered. If we need a five-lane section, we can build a five lane; if we don't need a five lane, we can build a three lane. There is this bridge effect that is shown on Page 5 of the staff report, and that figure is reproduced here, where essentially traffic leaves a higher order of facility to use a lower order of facility, the collector, to get back to a higher order of facility. And there's the existing section of 139th between Tenney and NE 10th, that's currently a relatively low volume local street, converting it to a minor arterial may pose some access issues. Despite these issues we still recommend this for approval. We believe that many of these issues can be addressed with the subsequent comprehensive plan amendment and the new arterial atlas.

Our second action for you to consider is amendment of our capital facilities plan. We don't have any stated amended criteria; however, from the status of that plan as an affordable document we're assuming that maintenance of the affordable status is the criterion. The amendment is simply a substitution of NE 139th Street for the NE 154th Street. The cost is the same, 9.3 million in the year 2000 dollars, and we are recommending approval.

The final action we have for you is amendment of the transportation concurrency ordinance. We're proposing this lowering of the level-of-service standard because County controlled roadway improvements cannot maintain the level-of-service above the current standard through all the years of the comprehensive plan. That interim year analysis was performed by Public Works using one of the micro simulation tools that we have available called Synchro. If you plot travel speed as it occurs in the corridor each of those interim years, assuming what we know now about proposed developments that have approval that aren't generating traffic on the corridor, and once we get beyond that point where we know what the development is, assuming either a one and a half percent traffic growth rate or a three percent traffic growth rate, if improvements occur on the schedule identified, the new level-of-service standard at 13 miles per hour would not be violated. But without lowering the level-of-service standard certainly, and certainly without achieving the I-5 interchange improvements that are assumed in this diagram to occur and come on-line roughly in 2011, the level-of-service standard would fall dramatically beyond even the current levels.

Making this change would allow the moratorium to be lifted. Staff expects that the corridor would remain open for the entire planning horizon, but is highly dependent upon those assumptions. The improvements act together to produce the resulting travel speed, take one away and the travel speed predicted will not happen. Notwithstanding all those assumptions, staff still recommends approval of this amendment. And that concludes the staff presentation. Turn it back to the Chair.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Dust from members of the Commission? Nothing at this time? Okay, we'll start with the public comment. I'd like to invite Lora Caine first, please.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

CAINE: Hi, I'm Lora Caine and I live at 3504 NW 191st Circle in Ridgefield. And I sure

appreciate you helping me out to be able to come first, I did sign-up first anyway so. I think that we have two problems facing the County right now. And the two problems are this: One is do we want to keep the corridor, the Salmon Creek corridor, the same livability standards that is expected by the public right now that the comprehensive plan is set up and therefore try to do our best to keep it running smoothly through there, or do we want to address the problem that means the moratorium has come into place preventing development from happening. So two problems are being addressed. And I look at it as one doesn't help the other. It, obviously development would not be happy if a moratorium de facto or formalized is kept in place to make it a nice easy going corridor to drive through. Right now it's really in bad shape and it should be looked at in that fashion because it already is and if we do anything worse it will get worse.

So going on with that, growth management, as you know, is a complex and delicately balanced mechanism and we need it to be balanced, carefully balanced. Any time something comes and disrupts that balance we have problems. Well, what happened is we had a 20-year growth plan and more than 20 years worth of growth -- well, not more than but a lot of that growth happened early, in the first five to ten years, not even ten years yet, and that caused a tipping of that balance. It, this area, the Salmon Creek, is deemed one of the three major activity centers in the comprehensive plan and it's so complicated. As Evan talked about, there are two freeways coming together, there's Highway 99 and 134th Street is the only east/west arterial that can get through that area and so all traffic has to go through that choke point, and so we're concerned that this might be a problem if you drop the standards any further because you're going to just add more cars automatically. Rapid growth caused the moratorium to occur, growth too fast cannot be addressed by County funds alone. And that's what the 23rd Avenue and the 139th Street crossing, that's, you know, approximately \$30 million. Do we have all that money come from the whole County's project, road projects, to go over and help this one problem, maybe, maybe not, that's up to you guys to recommend to the Commissioners. But the problem of lowering the standards causes worse problems because there will be more and more cars anyway.

But today's concurrency is working. That ordinance was in place to help make sure that growth happens in a steady even pace. If it all of a sudden growth happens way too fast and the County cannot keep up with enough funding to keep the projects going, to keep the capacity going to let it work, then the concurrency ordinance kicks in and says, wait a minute, slow down, let's catch up, let's work out a solution. And it doesn't even have to be a formalized moratorium, the de facto moratorium gets into place and that sets things up for let's get something done, but let's do it in a slow even pace, not a rapid rush job. So with that, we don't want to panic and throw out the standards that we have or lower it way down to 13 miles per hour, doing that, again, adds more traffic and it doesn't fix the problem, it just adds more traffic.

But I have four ideas that I thought might help. First of all, allowing the concurrency, today's concurrency ordinance, to stay in place with the standards that we have right now. If developers really really want to build right away, then let them come up with upfront money. Maybe some of you remember Pipeline One in the East County when they were held back from any of their developments from happening until they came up with money up front, millions of dollars to get it set up so they could start building right away. If you hold the concurrency ordinance today in Salmon Creek, the same kind of

thing could happen if you allow it to happen. Let those developers that want to be impatient and want the return on their investment today, let them come up with some money to help that happen. And, you know, if it means TIF, what are those called?

SMITH: TIF fees.

CAINE: Well, the TIF fees, but where you get money back if you put up money up front, anyway.

AUDIENCE: Credits.

CAINE: Credits, TIF credits. If it means TIF credits first, then let them have the TIF credits if it means they bring up money up front. Secondly, I think that the -- make sure that the long-range fixes that are needed in the area are put into a prioritized list of road things that need to be done, but, you know, let it happen in its proper time. And also encourage or find ways that C-TRAN can bring more buses out there to help congestion. Let drivers have more options to get around that congestion. And, thirdly, I think you need to close the loophole, and I know that there's going to be a speaker on that tonight that will go into more detail, but there's a loophole out there that allows larger chunks of land to be developed by the same developer where you can break them into smaller parcels and slip under the moratorium and without having to, to go through the studies that they have to go through.

And fourth, I think it's important that we have an allocation process involved. There are certain things that would be better to have in place first in this growth plan that we have such as family wage job businesses, maybe industry that is needed in the area, Legacy is a prime example of that. The community spoke and says, yeah, we're okay with letting Legacy come in and slip through that moratorium, let them do what they can to get their part done, but so those kind of things. If you have an allocation you can set up those things in order. Unfortunately residential development does not pay its way in return. These others, commercial and industrial lands, I mean developments, pay more in taxes than they take and from the County budget and infrastructure needs.

So, and, finally, it's the community that wants a livability, livable area to live in. Developers are speculators who want a guaranteed return on their investment which, you know, that's a business, but they want -- if they want quicker returns they should pay for it up front. If they want to get those returns later and not pay up front, then they just have to be patient and let that happen. So, therefore, I say keep it at the 22 miles per hour, go ahead and get those other plans and projects started and then go where it goes. Let the de facto take place if it has to. Thanks. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Caine?

CAINE: Great. Thanks.

LEIN: Thank you, Lora. Dolores Dougherty.

DOUGHERTY: I live at 3513 NW 179th Street. I was pretty excited to have shopping centers come to Salmon Creek, I was tired of going to Hazel Dell. I still resent the fact

30 years later I have to get on the dog-gone freeway in order to get down to Highway 99, I hope you folks will address that at some very near future point. It's the pits at my age to have to do two miles on the freeway just because you want to go south. I would really dispute the figures of 13 miles an hour through the 134th Street. It takes you 13 minutes just to go through those two darn signals. At 4:00 in the afternoon you want to avoid that area. It's just a hornet's nest. It's bogged down, you can't move, you don't want to go shopping, you want to stay as far away from Salmon Creek as you possibly can and that's sad. But I would agree with her comments that if development needs to come, I think the people that are going to do the developing, they should pay for it, it shouldn't be my taxes on my Social Security check. I've seen it happen 30 years ago in California and I really don't want to see it happen here. I definitely don't want to see you lower the standards so that more building can come in now with the traffic being in the situation that it is at the present time.

They did a lousy job at Chkalov Drive and Mill Plain and you've been throwing expensive Band-Aids at it ever since. This is another Chkalov Drive, and I think it might be even worse, and I see us spending a lot of expensive Band-Aids down the road. If you drop your moratorium now and allow the building to come in, you're going to make the situation even worse and I'm really opposed to that. I'd like to see it grow, I'm not antigrowth, I just think it should grow sensibly. I think that the industries that go in there should help to pay for it and hopefully they'll undue the idiocy that they did when they disconnected Highway 99 from 10th Avenue. Some day maybe somebody will fix that so that you don't have to get on the freeway, you can actually travel from Ridgefield all the way down Highway 99 and go do whatever it is you want to do in that area, but it's going to take some expensive remedies and you've already added a really nasty aspect to it by allowing the building at the Fairgrounds.

So good old Felida better get ready because they're going to have nothing but solid traffic every day. I feel sorry for those people because those of us west, how are we going to get out of the area, how are we going to travel, it's going to have to be up and down Felida. The only way I can get to the Fred Meyer's on 134th is to go up 179th east, turn right on 11th, go north till it dead-ends, residential area, turn left until it dead-ends, I sneak in the back of Fred Meyer's now because the traffic is so bad, that whole area is only going to get worse. And I don't even come in at 5:00 in the afternoon, I'm doing this -- I'm having to do this during the day in order to move around. You've got serious problems, you need to give it some serious thought, and I hope that you'll do some real long-range planning ahead of time and not start throwing Band-Aids at it again two years down the road. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission? Thank you. Kit Dennis.

DENNIS: I'm sorry, I thought that was just a sign-in sheet, I didn't realize that was to speak, but, hey, if you want to know my opinion.

LEIN: Okay, no problem. John Karpinski, I don't know your last name, John Karpinski.

KARPINSKI: You can tell I haven't been here for a while. My name's John Karpinski, I'm here on behalf of Clark County Natural Resources Council. Obviously we're not keen on the proposal that's in front of you; however, if there is an ultimate move or

desire that we're going to have to lower the road standards no matter what, let's do it for the right reasons, and so we recommend that you if the road standards are going to be lowered, that they be lowered with an allocation plan. The allocation plan should reserve 80 percent of the available capacity generated for jobs, jobs, jobs, necessary infrastructure and smart growth policies. Now when I say "jobs" I'm referring to family wage jobs and not the County's lame definition of "family wage jobs." I'm talking infrastructures like schools and parks. It's always ironic when under concurrency you can't build a school that you need to get to other concurrency issues because of the traffic issues. What the County's done historically, and illegally, has been to just exempt those proposals, you're not allowed to exempt things from concurrency.

The better proposal is to allocate a certain amount of your road capacity to things like jobs, hospitals, those kinds of things. And also let's reserve some capacity for smart growth projects. And I'm talking real mixed use projects where you have different kinds of use in one building, not putting a Costco next to an apartment complex and calling it mixed use. So if we're going to lower the road standards, let's do it for the right reasons. Let's get, you know, something out of the, for the community out of it, I think the allocation plan is the best way to do that.

I'm concerned about the proposal, it's not quite ripe yet. I think there's some quality of life concerns. I think there's some real air quality concerns. I think the air quality, if we just lower it without an allocation plan, I think we're really going to be able to hurt the ability to get new jobs in this community. It's great, I get to stand up here and be environmentalist for jobs, jobs, jobs. But if we lower the road standards, first of all, I've never heard a major employer come here and say, you know, we're moving to Clark County because the roads really stink, okay. Second, every time we've lowered the road standards before we've had a land rush of residential development, I mean, you know, count the number of times, I mean how many times does it take to be a trend, and the jobs are always at a competitive disadvantage. It takes a major employer a year and a half, two years to get on-line an average subdivision, Lonnie can tell you you can whip together on a cocktail napkin and get approved pretty quickly in this County. Sorry, I had to do that.

MOSS: Do we still live in the same County?

KARPINSKI: And but, no. And also if we substantially increase the air pollution, we're this close to being a nonattainment area; if we go into the nonattainment area, we're going to put further impediments on the ability to attract new jobs to this community. So I think what we should do is -- oh, and I'm also concerned about the consistency. Growth management requires your plan to be internally consistent, what we're doing is a 41 percent reduction in road standards, which means if we've done our planning and modeling right, and I understand that there were some concerns of modeling and all that, but if we did our job right, this would be a 41 percent increase in growth. We've already shown that the Legacy development wasn't part of our wonderful vacant buildable lands analysis so that's off-line, what other parts of the system is broken up there in terms of land use and shouldn't we look at that first out of the consistency requirement of GMA before we take these, this dramatic action to lower the road standards, I think we should.

So in conclusion, I think that the -- frankly the moratorium should be allowed to expire and that we take the time to do a growth allocation plan and do it right. I picked a number of 80 percent. I think the best thing to do would be a site-specific analysis for the area, see what kind of jobs deficit we have out there. Our plan is obviously out of balance. We're obviously doing more residential growth than the kind of job base growth we need to do. Do a statistical analysis out there to see what we need to do to bring our 20 year plan back into balance and then put together an allocation plan, we're going to have a de facto moratorium anyway in place, and then reduce the road capacity a little bit at a time, we don't need to knock it from 22 miles an hour to 13 miles an hour to hit a 2022 target today because you know that we'll use up the 2022 target by about 2010, let's take it a step at a time because that's the only thing that ever works in this County. So an allocation plan with incremental decreases that are of a benefit for the community and provide jobs is the way to go after more study. Thank you very much.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Karpinski? Thank you, John.

KARPINSKI: Thank you.

LEIN: George Vartanian.

VARTANIAN: Good evening, my name is George Vartanian, I live at 2217 NE 179th Street, Unit 5 in Ridgefield. Thank you for the opportunity to give you my thoughts on the topic at hand. Before making a decision to as to how to advise the County Commissioners in this matter I would like to offer the following: First, let me be clear that I'm not opposed to development if properly managed. The County correctly desires to promote development which will bring employment and in general improve the overall economic situation in the county.

LEIN: Excuse me, George, you're going to have to slow down, we have a court reporter here.

VARTANIAN: Oh, I'm sorry, I forgot. Do you want a hard copy?

LEIN: We've got it here.

VARTANIAN: I'm sorry.

LEIN: But you still need to slow down, please.

VARTANIAN: Okay, us guys from New York, we're just like that. The County correctly desires to promote development which will bring employment and in general improve the overall economic situation in the county. One of the things companies take into account in deciding where to move is the quality of life in the area under consideration. If companies are to attract workers, where they move must be attractive to those workers. Second, lowering the level-of-service to 13 miles per hour will in and of itself not only impact congestion over time, but would also permit more residential development which will further overload not only transportation infrastructure, but other services which have, pardon me, which already have inadequate funding like schools,

law enforcement, fire protection, parks and other services. In other words, further degrading the overall quality of life.

Third, in the long-term we are better off restricting development to projects which serve the long-term goals of the County and not react to immediate problems. This only exacerbates the problem while eliminating alternatives on a long-term basis. Some types of development are more welcome than others. Low impact development which provides employment has less of an impact on services and is therefore preferable to exclusively residential development. Finally, we must keep balance in mind since this is very important. The whole point of residential development is to provide places for people to live. The whole point in commercial and industrial development is to provide employment, commerce and help pay for services. If a development, residential or nonresidential, reduces the overall quality of life, there is no point in allowing it. Paying for itself is only one of the criteria for considering development. If unfavorable impacts offset the financial benefits, we are defeating our own objectives.

And I'd just like to make a quick comment about the Legacy comment, the issue previously brought forward. While I'm sure the Legacy project was not considered in the old establishment of the concurrency, as I understand it Legacy is prepared to bring concurrency standards back to where they are today, if not a little bit more, so that shouldn't have an impact on why we need to go down to 13 or come off the current levels. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Vartanian? Thank you. William Moyer.

MOYER: I believe in handing out in advance, I think it goes smoother that way. My name is William Moyer, I live at 14012 NE 47th Avenue. What I wanted to speak about was my perception of what the problem is and what a possible solution might actually be, at least in a new and different idea to take a look at. Basically what we've got is a concurrency corridor which is in failure. We have developers that would like to develop in that area and we have no money to fix any problems associated with it. I think there is a solution that is potentially there, I refer to it as incremental concurrency impact mitigation fees. It's very simple.

First off, we have a loophole right now in the present concurrency rules. If your project is below a critical size, even if you're right next to the failed concurrency corridor, you don't have to pay anything to mitigate the impacts that your project is going to have. Break it up into enough small chunks and it slides right under. I believe now something in excess of 600 homes in the Salmon Creek area have slipped under that loophole. So the first part of my proposal is that there be no minimum size project exclusion, all development projects would be required to pay either an appropriate concurrency mitigation cost as determined by completion of a concurrency impact study using computer models such as are done now. I admit that is not practical for small projects, and I'm not proposing that everybody go and buy massive computer models and feed Excel spreadsheets, but I do believe that there is a simple alternative that can be applied and it's really basically that you would have a default system so you can do the study or you can fall into either of two defaults.

One default would be an inflation indexed average per unit built, and by "per unit" I

would speak of per vehicle, per square foot, any scalable way of viewing a development project of a similar nature, and basically you would look at the indexed average per unit built of the impact mitigation fees that were previously assessed and paid on all similarly zoned projects within say a ten-mile radius that were completed within the last five years, that allows you to come up with a number fairly readily from existing public records. Alternatively you could pay some fixed percentage of the cost of the land to be developed or its present assessed valuation prior to the improvements being added. Either one would allow a developer to know up front what his costs are, and you're basically simply looking at pass-through costs that go to the end user.

So there is a cost of money involved that the developers would have to pay certainly, but it would allow them to develop and to be able to know what they're doing and you would assess it on every project within the area so that everybody pays, no exceptions, no exclusions. If you build a house, it's going to have cars, it's going to impact the corridor, nobody gets a free ride, nobody should get a free ride. I believe this proposal would result in a fair and equitable system. I don't claim it's perfect. I don't claim the exact numbers, ten miles, ten percent, et cetera, are necessarily the right numbers, but I do think it's an approach that should be considered. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Moyer?

BARCA: I have a question. Mr. Moyer, do you believe, then, that the level-of-service standard should not be lowered?

MOYER: If anything I would increase it. The fact that you're failing a criterion doesn't mean that you should lower the criterion so you can pass and pretend the problem doesn't exist. If you increased the criterion, then you would bring more developers in under this system that would be then paying to mitigate their impacts.

BARCA: We've had several testimonies about the aspect of the potential of using an allocation system for trying to create job growth over residential growth. Do you think --

MOYER: That is something that could certainly be folded into a system like this. You would perhaps come up with a slightly divergent set of rules for each type of development. There's nothing in this that would prevent you from applying an allocation system.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Any other questions?

MOSS: One. Mr. Moyer, how is what you're proposing different from the transportation impact fees that we currently assess on development?

MOYER: This would be applied to those developments which are within a critical distance of a concurrency sensitive corridor, one which is either in failure or about to go into failure, whereas I understand the basic transportation impact fees are simply applied with a set amount for any project and actually at a level sufficiently low that it doesn't honestly mitigate what they are going to require the roadways anyway. This

would be an additional source of funding to be directed at the areas that need the improvement and you wouldn't -- and by doing it on an incremental basis, by scaling it on a project on a say per square foot basis, you don't end up with a situation where, well, I want to build my new hospital, I guess I got to go build a freeway overpass to do that, it's you would provide a source of funding to allow the County to make the necessary needed improvements. It's not Company A comes in, puts in a freeway overpass, Company B comes in, they're smaller, they get to put in a stoplight. Simply to provide a scalable means of funding the incremental impacts and a pay-as-you-go plan seems to make sense to me.

MOSS: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Moyer. Glenn Tribe.

TRIBE: Thank you. Glenn Tribe, I live at 15701 NE 57th Avenue. I've lived in the area, grew up in the area, and I've seen the area grow over the years. I even started school at the old Salmon Creek School where the parking lot is, most of you don't know that area. I have a question or something that needs to be clarified in my own mind about the corridor as it's explained. The 134th Street goes east and intersects Salmon Creek Avenue which goes north and then turns into Salmon Creek Street and it intersects and it curves and then 50th Avenue goes north, and I drive that road quite a bit and very little traffic on that road. I mean to the extent that we're talking about going down to 22 miles an hour, most any time I drive that road you could drive 40 miles an hour if you want to. Most of the traffic occurs between on 134th Street and then goes north on the avenue prior to Salmon Creek Avenue. I don't know the number of that road or that avenue, but that's where most of the traffic goes, it doesn't go down to Salmon Creek Avenue and then on up to 50th Avenue.

The major part of the difficulty that's been growing and continues to grow with the new hospital and all the additions on the east side is at the big intersections there where you have several lights to go through, and I think that's what the concurrency problem is is those several intersections there. How do you get around that, you do another intersection or several other intersections to get people on the freeway or you keep them off the freeway. And any of you that might drive it's now 72nd Avenue is a major road, as is Andresen Road, and that's going to be a major, major problem and maybe a better solution, instead of trying to get more and more people through that Salmon Creek intersection is to put another corridor going down through the middle of the county that carries more and more traffic, whether that be widening 72nd, make that more of a major road so people don't funnel over and come down and try to get on the freeway. Of course that's more of a problem yet.

Now 503 is getting more heavily loaded all the time, that carries more traffic. Up that corridor that I explained, being up Salmon Creek Avenue, there's very little chance for any development along there. And one side of it is the college property and the other side is swampland where the creek runs, so there's very little chance that anything's going to be built along there. And as you go on out further north on 50th, most of that is out of the urban growth boundary and it doesn't seem like that's going to be included this go around; however, that might be changed.

So I think I'm in favor of what the staff has proposed contrary to the other speakers. I don't think if there is additional building goes on that people are going to tolerate going through that intersection, they're going to find other ways to go, so it's not going to immediately drop down. And most of the studies have to show that you build a house, it goes that road; if it isn't, they're going to go other roads and they're going to try to get down 72nd or they're going to go through Felida or they're going to maybe hopefully not have to go down at all and find one of those jobs that's going to be created as we know that's what's really needed. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Tribe? Thank you, sir. Dick Howsley.

HOWSLEY: No.

LEIN: No comment?

HOWSLEY: No.

LEIN: Doug Ballou.

BALLOU: Good evening, my name's Doug Ballou, I live at 3109 NE 96th Street and I'm with the Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County and I -- there's several good comments that I've heard tonight here, I wanted to fill in a few from a much broader perspective. One of my concerns as chairman of the neighborhood leaders in unincorporated Clark County is that this particular decision may set a precedent in some of the other corridors and may create spillover and additional concurrency failures in other places because of traffic diversion. As the previous gentleman had mentioned, people will find another way to go, well, there are other corridors and other issues. I will mention that three years ago I was on the Citizens Concurrency Advisory Committee so I am pretty well knowledgeable about how these, all these standards were set, and they were set based on an affordability level and a modeling technique that Mr. Dust has mentioned had some flaws, that to me that raises some questions about what potential modeling issues or assumptions may come up in other corridors a year from now.

So I think there's some issues about -- I haven't been really convinced, I haven't heard a compelling case this evening as to why the standard in Salmon Creek should be reduced. As we all know, Salmon Creek has been a major transportation challenge for a number of years, this isn't a new issue. These standards were developed close to three years ago. I realize that errors can be made, issues can come up about certain transportation corridors, I think what we have to put into perspective is that the comprehensive plan should be meant as a guidepost to -- rather than simply turn it around because current development doesn't seem to be matching the long-term plan therefore, let's change the plan by lowering a standard in one of the corridors. What will we do next, rezone major areas. Certainly, I mean these, we have to start somewhere and look for the long-term. These corridors are meant to be set for 20-year growth period; in other words development's expected to occur over the 20-year period. What's happening or what could potentially happen is because the standard gets lowered significantly in the Salmon Creek corridor, then all of a sudden a lot of the growth gets focused into that area. Do we really want to focus development at that

time in that place. Maybe, maybe not. If we look at the comprehensive land use plan the efforts focusing more on economic developing and jobs, how many jobs can be created in the Salmon Creek area, are they family wage jobs, what are the opportunities for that, are there other places in Clark County that really need, need that.

So we need a measured and a thorough approach to how this is done. Maybe 19 is the right number, maybe 15, maybe 9, I don't know. I -- from the brief presentation made by the staff tonight I don't think anyone could feel comfortable leaving here tonight feeling confident that for some reason 13 is the right number for the Salmon Creek corridor. Other areas we may be looking at that are 13 now, especially over on the east side along 500/503, maybe in a year or less than that from now they could be reassessing those at 9 miles per hour. At what point do you get where it's to the level where you might as well not have a standard. Those are some of the concerns I have from a broader countywide perspective. I think any solution up in Salmon Creek is going to be very, very expensive. I think all the studies we've looked at over the last several years, the citizens groups that's been involved in that, has really really shown that there's no cheap solution here, it can't be borne solely by the County, by the taxpayer, it's got to be a public/private partnership, and I think by dropping the standard to 13, significantly dropping the standard, that just opens the door to even creating a much worse situation up in that area. With that, I would recommend that from the standard, not to lower the standard based on what's been provided here tonight. And that concludes my testimony. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Ballou?

RUPLEY: I have a question.

BALLOU: Yes.

RUPLEY: If lowering the standard were part of what you said in terms of several solutions would you support it at that point or would you say at this point that we should not lower the standard?

BALLOU: Do you want me to give you an example of where it might be appropriate to maybe lower the standard. For instance, let's take a jobs -- a situation where we're looking at Legacy is planning to locate in that area, I would say that where there's a major investment being made in the community and there's a couple of benefits, there's 600 family wage jobs there, clearly there's the health, the much needed health services that we need in our community, especially here in the west and the north side of Clark County, from that perspective, then it might be appropriate to lower it to allow that sort of a development to occur with an agreement with Legacy that they fund part of, some of the mitigation, but certainly not to wide open the door to let anyone come in, but there should be some priorities in terms of what development does come in and it's appropriate. And that's what gets to my comment, it should be a thoughtful and measured process here, not simply let's just lower the standard to 13. In fact let's lower it at every corridor, I've heard that statement made, and even, maybe even 9 miles per hour. We need to, we need to look at each of these corridors as unique areas, which they are, and these situations are very much situational as to what's going on there and what do we want to encourage and not encourage so.

RUPLEY: Okay, thanks very much.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Ballou.

BALLOU: Thank you.

LEIN: Art Stubbs.

STUBBS: Good evening, my name is Art Stubbs at 6804 NE 86th Court. I am a member of NACCC and also of the Green Meadows Neighborhood Association. I'd like to thank the Commission for their time and dedication in doing things like this, it's not an easy job. The goal of each of the neighborhoods associations in representing the homeowners and businesses and renters and service people in their area is to join with others in maintaining neighborhood livability. Nothing is cut in stone and communities must be ready to accept change; however, 20 years of change in 5 to 7 years is a great deal to ask. As stated earlier, if it's done here, will it be done elsewhere. It's just as important for a member of our community to be able to look to the future and plan as it is for our government. The investment in a home or a business for their families is no small matter and should not be overlooked. Please think about neighborhood livability. Thank you again for your concern.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Stubbs?

BARCA: Mr. Stubbs, just for the record, does that mean you're opposed to lowering the level-of-service?

STUBBS: Yes, I would like to maintain it as it is.

BARCA: Thank you.

STUBBS: We have a huge development going in on 88th Street which you people are probably dealing with now. I really am not in favor of watching the established communities such as Green Meadows and others around the area, you have a great deal of them on the corridor that you're looking at now, become instant slums. And I think if you look in other cities where you had major developments or major impacts on a local community, it does seem to downgrade it, not just the homes but the businesses as well, and I think that's what you're looking at. You know, I don't envy you your job not in any way, I really don't, it's not an easy decision, but in looking at the entire Clark County and seeing just what the impact is going to be in other areas, you have Fourth Plain coming in, you know, that's going to be major industrial, we're all looking for jobs, we all want jobs, but it's always, you know, yeah, but let's keep it away from where I live. And we all feel the same way, not in my backyard. At some point it is in our backyard and we have to make the best of it, but let's choose the right way and take it easy on it. Thank you again.

LEIN: Just a minute, one more question, please.

STUBBS: Surely.

RUPLEY: If we take Mr. Ballou's example of the last time in terms of lowering the standards would you not lower standards at the exclusion of Legacy not coming?

STUBBS: If I were to lower standards it would really have to be with an overlook of the entire area that's being impacted, and I would disagree with that assessment, it would have to be something that would really benefit the community to an incredible amount before I would ask people living within that area to, you know, take the brunt of the impact of it.

RUPLEY: Okay, thanks.

STUBBS: You're welcome.

LEIN: Goldie Glock.

GLOCK: Well, I was one of those folks that --

LEIN: Goldie, could you come up and state your name and address for the record, please.

GLOCK: Sure. My name is Goldie Glock and my address is 1502 NW 189th Street in Ridgefield. And I hadn't planned to come up, I just thought I was signing in, but now that I'm up here I would like to say that I am with you folks and probably one of the only few sitting here that is on getting something changed. For the while that I've been living out in Ridgefield I've been waiting I don't know how long for a decent restaurant to come out our way, even more than one. I think so many people that live in our area say that because we don't have anything out there that, you know, if you want a nice dinner you have to go, well, into Portland or somewhere away from where we live. And as far as going down to 13 miles per hour, that doesn't bother me a bit because if I can't get through one way, I find some other way to go. I don't have to go through there, and maybe with me not going through there it makes it go by a little faster, but just going down to 13 miles an hour does not bother me, that's not much less than 22. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Dennis Johnson.

JOHNSON: Thank you. My name is Dennis Johnson, my address is 16417 NE 26th Avenue, Ridgefield. I thought I was like Goldie signing to acknowledge my presence here, but since you gave me the opportunity I'll make a couple of short comments. I've lived at that address since 1994 and I've driven through the intersections we're talking about on where 134th goes over the highways almost daily since that time, and there's many days when I've driven through there several times, so I've seen it get more and more congested in the nine years since I've had to use it. There's been a lot of decisions made by Commissions in this nine-year period that I think it degraded the livability of the region to the Salmon Creek area and I would like for the pendulum now to start swinging back the other way and some decisions made that would maybe make it a little more pleasant to live there, to have access in and out. My real first choice to solve the problems of the congestion is for there to be fewer cars but I know

that's not a realistic solution, so I would like the road improvements that are required to maintain the current level-of-service to be made. I recognize that they're expensive, but I think we need to accommodate the cars because we're not going to be able to eliminate them. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Johnson? Thank you. Bridget Schwarz.

SCHWARZ: My name is Bridget Schwarz, I live at 2110 NW 179th Street in Ridgefield. And when the County gave me that map, I told them I'd put a lot of miles on it and I have. I'm here to speak on behalf of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association. I don't have the luxury of telling you what I think, I'm going to tell you what they think because we survey them on an awful lot of issues and when I gave a quick look of the -- to our executive board of the past surveys that we have done that just delete every question that wasn't traffic related, it was three pages of eight point font. There's a lot of it that we're going to have to talk about tonight, but first I wanted to show you our neighborhood. Is it okay if I stand up here and point?

LEIN: As long as the mic can pick you up.

SCHWARZ: Let's try this. Okay. The colored areas are the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association, 219th is our top border, the river, 72nd and then we zig and zag along the bottom, but this about 149th and then down to about 119th. Inside our neighborhood association boundaries we've got two freeways, I-5 and I-205, and we've got Highway 99, that makes us a natural activity center. We've got the Fairgrounds, one road up and what we're calling the 800-pound gorilla which is the amphitheater with it using that exit and unopened and the kinds of traffics there's still an awful lot of speculation of how it's going to impact, that 800-pound gorilla may back stuff up to 134th Street and we want you to consider that.

We also have Washington State University. We have them going from a two year to a four-year school. We have three grade schools all in one place over here, we have a hospital. And I have to tell you that we did ask our members whether they would approve of Legacy at that hospital, at that site, and 79 percent of them said yes. The reasoning is the community needs this and we'll deal with the traffic because it's worth it. Within a half mile of this 134th Street corridor we have every fast food and gas station franchise or brand known to man. We also under the 20-year growth plan that we've adopted understand that the rural nature our area is a illusion. The 179th Street intersection off of I-5 is pretty much ground zero for what is targeted to be the second densest population area in the county after Vancouver.

So we are scheduled for growth. And we look at what happened in East County over the last few years and said, oh, it's coming and it is. Right now if you talk to the people that live in our area and use this thing, we hear a lot of references to this is going to be like Mill Plain, this is going to be like Mill Plain, it already is. If you ask our neighborhood residents to describe it, they're not going to say it's bothersome, I'll find a way around it, it's the most often description you'll hear is it's intolerable right now. And before it gets better we're going to have 600 new homes that have already been approved since the moratorium came in, and I'm going to explain to you how that happens in a second. We're going to have the added traffic 900 p.m. peak hours from

the hospital and all the other stuff that comes down the pipeline and that's before you put one shovel in the dirt to fix the problem. And even so, when you put construction, they'll start construction on a project from I-205 to WSU, and, Glenn, your nice commute is going to slow real down when they have to choke it down to construct. So even when you take a look at a situation that's intolerable now, going to get worse because of trips that have already been approved but aren't on the system and then you're going to start doing some construction to fix it, you've got people out there that are going to be very anxious and angry about the situation.

So the way it works is we have this transportation concurrency and each County sets their own transportation standards and we have those 34 transportation corridors and we have one in failure. The way they do it is they drive from point A to point B with a stopwatch and then they drive from point B to point A and how long it takes, that's what you're dealing with as far as the travel speed standard. And as Glenn pointed out, and as staff pointed out, the problem isn't once you get past WSU, there you can go, it's getting through other parts of the corridor. So what happens is when you bring in an application and you do your traffic studies, they run the model and they say that these are the impacts of your proposed developments and if it brings the travel speed down to one of these transportation corridors below the level-of-service, the County has no choice but to deny that development, that's the de facto moratorium that people have been referring to.

The developer can, however, offer to pay for improvements that Clark County agrees will raise that transportation corridor or mitigate their traffic impacts so they've restored the travel speed. The problem is there are no cheap fixes in the Salmon Creek corridor, so they came up with a formal moratorium. The first moratorium was less than half of the size of the one that they ultimately adopted, and if you see on the map a dotted line around the area, that is the formal moratorium that they're talking about. Their reasoning from the Board was sort of, well, we'll have to deal with it. Well, we could have stated in a de facto moratorium forever, but development is in all reality ceased. So they put together a formal moratorium which meant they had to come up with a work plan and come up with solutions and that's why we're here tonight.

There are problems with a de facto moratorium, there are problems with a formal moratorium, and that's what I want to show you. Let's start with the formal moratorium. The definition of the formal moratorium boundary is that it encompasses 75 percent of the traffic that contributes to what you have on the failed corridor. If it doesn't contribute traffic in that level, then it doesn't get included in the moratorium boundary. You can look on this map and you'll see lots of plots right on the boundary that are 20 acres with two houses on it. Well, of course they're outside the formal moratorium boundary, but that doesn't mean that they can't be developed. There's 177 homes right there. There's 350 homes. Now you can see they're inside the formal moratorium boundary, but that's the second boundary, the first one was much smaller, they got in after that first one and were grandfathered in when the larger boundary was done. There's another 74 homes. Again, they got in contingently vested between the time that we had the smaller moratorium boundary and the larger moratorium boundary, but still outside that boundary are many more areas that will be developed. Recently the County decided when they were going to come up with the end of the moratorium by April 1st, that they would begin to accept pre-application conferences for new homes in

the area, so now that's 163 more homes, that's 89 more homes that are in the pre-application process.

So that's under the terms of the formal moratorium. So we fall back to the de facto moratorium that everybody's been talking about. Well, the de facto moratorium has some problems too. All you have to do is study one mile from your project if you have up to 50 p.m. peak hour trips. All you have to do for two miles is if you're 51 to 250. If you're 251 or more then you have to study for three miles. So you would think that that development that has 74 would have to study for two miles. You would think the development that has 350 would have to study for three miles. You would think that the development for 163, two miles. The one for 89, two miles. Well, that isn't how it works because developers minimize on paper the traffic impacts by dividing those developments into separate tax lots and then submitting separate applications for each tax lot in the project. And when that doesn't exactly work, then they are routinely granted boundary line adjustments so they can do it. So the two that are here, instead of 74 homes they submitted as 50 plus 24. Those, the 350, they submitted a series, every one of them was less than 50. The one that's 177, four applications, each less than 50. The one that's 163, four applications, each less than 50. The one that's 89, two applications less than 89. Now somebody isn't paying attention to the rules of the game here because one of the applications that was filed yesterday was for 74 homes, but when they get in front of the Department of Community Development, the helpful planners will explain to them how to divide it into tax lot parcels and put it into smaller units. So what happens is all these homes, there were 600, that have come in since the moratorium was put in, then we said moratorium, if you're not in, you can't come in, but we'll start accepting pre-application conferences and scheduling those as of mid February. So on February 19th, yesterday, the pre-application conference came, schedule came out and there are 460 more homes.

You know the homes don't bring in as much in expenses as they do or in -- they don't bring in as much taxes as they do in expenses. You're trying to follow a path of getting this economic development in the area, but you've already got over 1,000 homes before you get one more gas station or fast food, much less a good family wage job in a medical office building around a hospital. So your formal moratorium because of its definition we'll have huge tracts of land outside it. Your de facto moratorium has loopholes large enough to drive over 1,000 houses through. And on top of that you want to reduce travel speed standards to 13 miles an hour. Okay. If you reduce travel speed standards to 13 miles an hour, then all these new developments that come in don't violate the concurrency standards, therefore they pay only the traffic impact fees that everybody has to pay for the projects' traffic that, the traffic their projects create, and none of them will have to pay for the mitigation of the fix of the Salmon Creek corridor. So basically we're seeing flaws all over the place in going forward with this.

So we've got some conclusions and this is based on again the surveys that we do of our members. We asked them: Would you agree that lowering the travel time standards is an acceptable means to prevent future development moratoriums in the Salmon Creek area, 82 percent said no. Then we boxed them in, we said if no, 82 percent, should current established concurrency travel time standards, measures and laws be maintained regardless of impacts on future development, and 89 percent said yes. We asked about the loophole where they use each tax lot parcel in a large project

to break it down to 50, should the County code be changed to prevent this loophole, 94 percent said yes. About the boundary line adjustments that enable these people to weasel them if they can, if they haven't got it flat out with the way it's platted, should we close that loophole, 94 percent said -- or should we allow those BLAs to be granted, 93 percent said no. We asked them about maintaining the 22 mile an hour travel speed, obviously they're saying no. We asked them if we should do something about allocating traffic capacity, (inaudible) question Number 5, our available traffic capacity is allocated to development projects on a first come, first serve basis, should traffic capacity be reserved for specific types of developments, 66 percent said yes. We asked them about the zoning code that gives every kind of job the same kind of traffic allocation, state and county transportation corridors in the area are at or --

LEIN: Yes, slow down, would you.

SCHWARZ: Am I going too fast. Okay.

LEIN: Thank you.

SCHWARZ: State and county transportation corridors in the area are at or near capacity, larger projects use more available traffic capacity than smaller developments, what action do you favor, 76 percent said a moratorium on further development until traffic capacity improvements are made. 23 percent said no moratorium on further development by spending more tax money and impact fees now on building more traffic capacity. We asked them to consider the system-wide impacts of projects and scheduled accordingly. We asked them about all of the jobs that are going to come into play within our area, and 43 percent of our members said don't start messing with 179th Street or any of these other places until the State, County and 219th interchange are complete. We haven't given up on the 219th interchange apparently. We asked about how to pay for it, 57 percent of us said adopt a new gas tax dedicated solely to County road improvements.

And in 2002 we asked if County does approve local road fund plans, who should bear the cost of the transportation improvements, 33 percent said developers, 22 percent said a local improvement district, 19 percent said a countywide gas tax, 13 percent said take it from the general fund and the rest of them were in the "other" category. We asked about other fixes in 2002 and we talked about light rail, we asked them to rate light rail from zero to five, zero being no way and five to being a great idea, and we hit both ends of the spectrum with very little in between. 25 percent said no way, 36 percent said great idea. The problem is that 27 percent of them would never use it, 50 percent would rarely use it, 21 percent would frequently use it and only 2 percent would use it for a daily commute. But we also asked do you support mass transit in our area, 78 percent said yes.

So our recommendations are that you approve the staff request for an arterial atlas amendment, that you approve the staff request for a transportation capital facilities plan amendment, that you deny staff's request for a level-of-service reduction on the Salmon Creek corridor. We believe that some of the errors that we are talking about that led to this problem were indicators of some fundamental problems. When they talk about not anticipating the impacts from a development like Legacy, if you look at

that 24-acre site, incredibly under the vacant and buildable lands model zero trips were attributed to that site. 24 acres, zero trips. So we think that there may be some fundamental flaws that we need to address. So we ask that you forward the following recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners. These steps will allow continued development in the Salmon Creek area without sacrificing the residents' quality of life.

First, although flawed, keep the formal moratorium in place until all the problems with transportation planning and traffic modeling and traffic capacity allocation are remedied. As a result, applicants will not be allowed to reserve future traffic capacity at this time. Two, maintain the 22 mile an hour travel speed standard on the Salmon Creek corridor. Three, close the loopholes that allow residential developments to avoid the true traffic impacts that their projects create. Four, allocate traffic capacity giving preference to family wage jobs. Five, subdivide the commercial zoning code to encourage development of family wage jobs. Six, consider the system-wide impacts of construction projects and schedule accordingly. Seven, adopt a local road fund plan with targeted investments to maintain concurrency. And, eight, work with C-TRAN to develop mass transit options for our area. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Bridget?

RUPLEY: I'd just like to make a comment.

BARCA: It was very comprehensive, thank you.

RUPLEY: Your neighborhood association needs to be proud of you because you did your work very well.

SCHWARZ: Thank you.

LEIN: We'd like to take about a five-minute break and then we'll get back.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: I'd like to reconvene the meeting. We will continue on with the public hearing, continuing on with the sign-in sheets. Tom Black, please.

BLACK: Good evening, my name is Black, Tom Black, my family and I live at 13915 NW 10th Court, Salmon Creek Meadows, and I'll make this relatively brief. This, I'm pretty much a neophyte at appearing before you folks. I've only appeared one other time and that was when some of us in the Salmon Creek Meadows got together at the new middle school I believe it was in regards to the Fred Meyer building, and I was amazed that during part of the testimony that Fred Meyer's said, well, this land that is zoned for a series of small businesses, I believe there's a hardware store, a gift shop, maybe a jewelry shop, a grocery store, a hardware store, we need that because we are really independent stores inside one building, isn't that neat, we're a jewelry store but that has nothing really to do with the overall store, which we all know is BS. And here I come here tonight and I wasn't aware of some of the things, I scratch my head, out in the Salmon Creek area all these houses going in and I really appreciate Mrs. Schwarz

pointing out how there was ways and techniques to squeeze in underneath that wire fence in order to get the permits through. That Salmon Creek area, I'm sure you've all driven through it, try it at about 4:00, try it at 5:00, try it at 5:30, and I'm amazed that we are here tonight spending our valuable time talking about lowering the standard further.

I mean the kid across the street from us who lives with his parents, just out of high school a year, is a Marine Corp Reserve, he went down to Pendleton two weeks ago because he's been called up by the country, now when do we need some more Marines, and being a former infantry captain in the '60s I think I know a little bit about running an infantry unit, do you think we ought to lower some of the standards. I mean if they can't hit a target at 140 meters, 160 meters, 120 meters, maybe we ought to if they hit it at 60 meters that's okay. If we need some more helicopter pilots, if they can't fly at nighttime but they can fly at daytime, well, that's okay. I cannot see lowering standards in order to meet what some folks' objectives are. If we don't have enough teachers, heck with a college degree, we'll go to a high school degree. If our high school kids can't pass the test, make them pass an 8th Grade test, they still finished, right, as long as we lower the standards.

In conclusion, I look back here at the motto in this room and adding a few more words in there it's not so much where we stand stuck in the traffic at Salmon Creek, but it's which direction are we moving, are we going to totally stop. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Black? Thank you. Joshua Scoville. Steve Stuart.

STUART: Good evening, my name is Steve Stuart and I live at 300 West 23rd Street in Vancouver, and I'm the executive director of Friends of Clark County. And just to start off with, on the proposed actions themselves, we actually agree with the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association in that we are supportive of two of the three proposed actions and not supportive of the amendment to the transportation concurrency management system. Not at this time at least.

Just to start off with kind of on a narrow focus with concurrency, concurrency is not necessarily the best tool that we have in the tool box, but it does provide some certainty that at least a narrow set of infrastructure will be provided along with the urban level development that we are anticipating in urban growth areas. The problem with not providing those services, and transportation is one of many, but not providing the transportation infrastructure is that you get more pressure to move outside those urban growth boundaries. A lot of congestion inside Salmon Creek gets people angry about the congestion, it makes them think, you know, I'd really love to live in an area where there isn't this problem and then they move out to Ridgefield and then the problem moves that direction and so on and so on. So concurrency is not necessarily the best tool, but it is a good tool to have.

The second thing is that just lowering the level-of-service standard is actually a common practice in this state. The concurrency requirement does leave some room for local governments to address a lowering of the level-of-service requirement, and there are areas, and you've talked about it some this evening, where that is appropriate because congestion isn't necessarily a bad thing in urban areas, it's how do we deal with that congestion, how do people get out of that congestion, and that's where

concurrency fails us is that it is too narrowly focused. We have to look broader than that and we have to look at what is concurrency trying to do. It is trying to address the number of trips within a given corridor. The trips we're talking about are vehicle trips, but the reality is I don't care if a car travels through the corridor and no one's in it, I care if the people can move through the corridor, that's what we should be caring about, not how many cars can get through. When we start looking at it in that way, we start looking at a variety of solutions, and I'm not going to get into all of the solutions generated this evening, there have been a lot of very creative solutions that have been offered, but before just lowering the level-of-service standard we need to kind of think about, okay, why are we lowering that level-of-service requirement and what do we get out of it. If we just lower the level-of-service, we'll get additional traffic, we have no solution other than a couple of road fixes that may take some of the initial pressure off but are not going to solve the long-term problem.

Let's look at some creative solutions like what a couple of the speakers, Bill Moyer had some solutions, Lora Caine, Bridget Schwarz, John Karpinski, the idea of allocation is one that absolutely is appropriate. We are talking about increasing our economic development focus in this county. There are examples of allocation plans for concurrency used elsewhere that have been successful and they're absolutely legal, to be able to say, look, we want these kinds of trips generated. We also need to look beyond that, like I said, to alternatives, and that is implicating our land use system and the internal consistency with our land use system that Mr. Karpinski mentioned, and we need to look at mixed use developments as an opportunity for people to walk, to bike, to live and work close together because I don't believe that everyone wants to live and work far from one another. I actually live very close to where I work and I very much enjoy it. My commute is zero and that is a very positive thing for my quality of life and there are others like me out there. So looking at land use practices that may help us out.

Also looking at mass transit alternatives, bike paths, pedestrian alternatives, these are the kinds of ways that we can reduce trips in the corridor without the expense of roads because roads are not the quickest, cheapest or safest alternative, they're just not. Mass transit and other alternatives such as walking and biking provide a much quicker alternative to get people moving. And even if you need some road improvements in a given corridor, think about the construction and how you get caught in the traffic during construction, you're going to need that much more mass transit alternative and I would ask that you please do not do these transportation changes in the road system and erase the C-TRAN Park and Ride at 134th before there's another Park and Ride up and running, that's one key in that if you take out that Park and Ride which is packed on a daily basis during the weekdays, if you take that out without an alternative, you will destroy C-TRAN, I guarantee it, because if people don't have C-TRAN as an option for a period of even one or two months, they'll find another way to get to work, and once they've changed that pattern of behavior, it's really hard to get them to change back.

The final thing that I wanted to just mention is that if you are going to lower the level-of-service standard, the County should go into it with eyes wide open regarding the Legacy development project. That if I were Legacy and I heard that you were going to be lowering the level-of-service and I could save between 4, you know, 3 and \$5 million by just waiting you out, I would do it. There is no question I would do it. So I

would hope that the County would consider that and go into these negotiations with Legacy with an eye toward letting them know where we are at and trying to figure out some middle ground so that they don't feel like they are getting the short end of the stick if we do lower the level-of-service requirement. And I'll end with that, thanks.

LEIN: Any questions for Mr. Stuart? Thank you. David Wilcox. Tate Fanning or Cole Fanning. Jordan, I can't read the last name. Okay. Drew Malbica. Must have been all our Scout friends. Ben Weiss or Weiss. Ray Bliven.

BLIVEN: My name is Ray Bliven, I live at 3106 NE 188th Street, it's about three miles north of the 134th Street corridor. I'd like just to make one point as far as what is being asked on the third action item on the traffic speeds that it is as my understanding that that speed is measured across the full path, which I think Mr. Dust indicated to me was about 2.2 miles. You earlier heard one of the neighbors there saying that the eastern part of that corridor is not at this time heavily impacted, I believe that is true. The times I've gone through there, even at the peak hours, what you're doing is you're measuring the failure in the eastern or the western third of the corridor. At right now if it's at 20 miles per hour and you're going between 40 and 45 in the eastern two-thirds, that means you're averaging 9 miles per hour on that last three-quarters of a mile on the western side. Lowering that to 13 miles per hour means that you're going to be averaging about 5 miles per hour on that eastern third because this is not fairly going to affect the entire length of the corridor. So at 5 miles an hour I, even I can walk that fast. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Ginger Edwards.

EDWARDS: My name is Ginger Edwards, I live at 2217 NE 179th Street. I also own light manufacturing property in the corridor so I live and own property in the corridor. I decided to speak after hearing about some of the other projects that might be happening in this area. I purchased that land in 1991, the type of business I have is very unique to the type of land that it can do business on, which is heavy industrial or light manufacturing. I have been trying to put a building on that site since 1991, I've had various problems. I have built a County road, which is on the diagram, it shows there, I've built a stormwater facility, I'm in the corridor right now doing business without a building and I'm out \$500,000 right now in land and improvements and still can't build a building. To understand that 1,000 homes might be going in and I'm still being denied because of that inability to get five trips and I'm already in the corridor and it's very distressing to me. I don't have a solution, that's not why I'm talking to you, I'm talking to you so that you can hear the frustration from some other points. I live there and work there so it's I have both perspectives. Do you have any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Edwards? Thank you very much. That completes the sign-up list, is there anyone we have missed? Would you please come up and state your name and address for the record, please.

STEIN: For the record my name is Howard Stein, my business address is CTS Engineers, 3300 NW 211th Terrace, Hillsboro, Oregon 97124. Let me preface I must say by that I am one of those evil traffic engineers that's been submitting traffic studies for the County for almost the last 15 years and I just want to put some of this into

perspective and into what has happened in this corridor, what can be done and what other jurisdictions do. Years ago I remember the big fight about the Salmon Creek Fred Meyer, which I didn't do that traffic impact study, but there was a lot of anxiety about all the trips it would generate and its impact; however, I did do traffic studies before and after Fred Meyer opened and after, before they opened and after they opened, and the impact of Fred Meyer was dramatic. It virtually decreased traffic going across I-5 and we found the counts going over I-5 despite over that period of time hundreds of homes being built west of I-5 traffic actually went down crossing the bridge. So that's what's the impact of appropriately located uses can have on helping reduce trips by providing land uses that are needed in certain areas with a deficit of use. Having to deal with concurrency a lot for a good many clients in many jurisdictions in this area, in Olympia, a little bit in the Seattle market and throughout Oregon, there's been some perspective of what the real issue is and the real issue is as you become an urbanized area it's how to manage congestion and tough decisions have to be made about how you manage it.

Let me give you a couple of contrasts. I did the traffic study for the expansion of the hospital that as you cross the, Emanuel Hospital which is across the Fremont Bridge is to your right, and the issue became in doing that traffic study that the Kerby Street off-ramp to that hospital, which leads to the hospital, in northeast Portland and which northeast Portland fought to not have that ramp come off and (inaudible) an arterial through that northeast neighborhood, at that time the City wanted the hospital to reconstruct part of that arterial and the issue became as it's a trade-off, people are now stacking on this ramp. If we make the improvement that the City wants we're now going to dramatically ruin the neighborhood because now all these people now infiltrate the area that by having the ramp act as it does now, a simple stop and go intersection, that it meters traffic through the area and manages the congestion through the area so that it's not a big surge of traffic, but the only people affecting it are the people sitting on that ramp, and it's their choice then to not use transit, to sit on that ramp. And now about 15 years later and it seems to work fine, a lot better than if we had blasted an arterial and just ruined the neighborhood.

Another example of congestion management is up in Olympia. We did the traffic study for the Olympia mall. And their system of concurrency works that they have defined what can practically be done at an intersection and as long as all those things that can practically be done are done, then you simply -- and then you have to pay your impact to make those things happen, and above that you pay your traffic impact fees, but if an intersection operates at a level-of-service F, that's okay, but we've done everything practical we can do short of building huge interchange for the (inaudible) and inappropriate, but they've defined up front what can practically be done. As the gentleman up before me mentioned, as mentioned earlier, you have a tough nut to crack on the 134th Street corridor. The issue is many years ago for whatever reasons decisions were made and when that interchange was put in and Highway 99 was there and 20th Avenue was there, that was a bad design from square one, okay, it didn't take this hundreds of homes reasonable growth to make this fail.

So the question is what to do now and I'm going to offer some ideas about, again, how to manage the congestion and maybe how to pay for it. I think what you have to recognize is that this was a fundamental issue that was about to happen irregardless

of any of the homes coming in and just the actual cost of development that's going to occur and there is a project going through these systems to improve some of that as best as you can. And maybe that's a philosophy to take that you should help in ways of funding quicker that improvement that is the best thing you can do for that corridor and just accept that congestion is going to occur there, and the trade-off being that you create either additional and spread that burden because a lot of the new developers and people who are coming in didn't make that decision to design it that way, for whatever reason the County and the State made that decision, but at the same time it can be balanced either by -- some people mentioned that they wouldn't mind paying an extra penny a gas tax or whatever to help do certain improvements in congestion areas as well as maybe special assessments for certain areas as new developments occur, but to have a 22 mile per hour standard that applies to that really tight stretch of roadway that's fundamentally flawed from the design from the get-go, it's not appropriate.

Now that standard may be appropriate for the rest of this section which is more applicable to the nature of the arterial, but it really isn't for that short section of highway. I mean I've done several traffic studies and made the recommendations, for the life of me I don't know why that I-5 northbound off-ramp doesn't have three lanes, you have plenty of room to expand it for three lanes and turn two heading west over I-5, it's practical, you have the right-of-way to do it. I've written in traffic studies two or three times, you know, WSDOT hasn't listened or whatever, I don't, I don't know. But, you know, the issue is congestion is going to occur and in some places perhaps you simply need to accept it, this is where it's going to happen, and this area is fundamentally flawed in its design outside of millions of dollars to do things where you have some things, I don't know what the cost of that project is, or maybe the way that I said is to accept this area, maybe take it out of the concurrency evaluation with the traffic accelerating to make this happen and just accept that's going to occur, but protect other things where there are options before things get so bad in those areas. So it's sort of a compromise. Anyway, that's my thoughts of how to do this deal with this tough nut that you guys have to find a way to crack.

LEIN: Any questions? Thank you. Is there anyone else we missed? If not, we'll return to the Planning Commission. Questions of staff? Comments from members of the Commission?

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: Well, let's see, where do we go. I think I'd like to start off with having staff address the issue of the small lot residential development that has been able to pass underneath the moratorium limits and that the number that's been estimated by the Fairgrounds neighborhood group is at the 600 home level.

SCHWARZ: 600 have been approved, 400 were applied for yesterday, 470 were applied for yesterday.

BARCA: So we're talking closer to 1,000. Is this why 13 miles per hour is the only logical choice residential growth?

DUST: That's an entirely different question.

BARCA: Okay, let's go back to my first one.

DUST: Okay. The first question is how is this happening. The current transportation concurrency ordinance has a distance limitation. The distance limitation basically is a function of what's reasonable to ask in terms of doing studies because each time you ask somebody to do a study, staff has to review that study, it takes staff time. So if you drop -- at some point you have to say a development is so small you're not going to examine the impacts of that size of development that's based in Salmon Creek on Orchards or on South County or some other area that's relatively removed. Those standards were set in the transportation concurrency ordinance, as Bridget described them it's basically 50 trips, up to 50 trips you go one mile out, from 51 to 250 you do two miles out, once you get over to 350 or 250 you go three miles out regardless of how much bigger you get beyond that point.

The issue, it doesn't matter how you define that standard, how, what that distance limitation is, whether you say, okay, you can do ten trips and you go one mile out and then anything over them ten trips, as long as I can find parcels that are legal lots that I can submit an application for a subdivision or a short plat on a legal lot, if I find five legal lots and I know each legal lot can get me ten houses or ten, the ten trips, and the standard's ten trips, then I'm going to submit five separate applications. And I'll -- Rich Lowry's here to address the legal challenges of handling that issue, but fundamentally as I see it it's if you allow a legal lot to submit an application, I'm not sure that there is a legally defensible way of saying, well, you submitted an application today, you don't get to submit an application for in this area for, what, until six other people get to submit applications or ten other people get to submit applications. I'm not sure given the way our system is structured that you can limit people from doing something which is naturally assumed to be a-okay, which is you have a legal lot and you submit an application.

BARCA: I think you gave me a philosophical rendition of what I consider a loophole. I know what you're saying, Evan, but I think it's clear what Bridget pointed out was specifically a way to get around the limitations of the moratorium, and I believe staff recognizes that this loophole has been in place, and even though it's been addressed to staff on numerous occasions there has been no movement by the County to try and plug the hole which is leaking continual additional trips into the moratorium area.

SCHULTE: Commissioners, let me try and answer the question and related question. I'm Steve Schulte with Public Works. First of all, we're on the second generation rule with respect to this trip limitation concept. Under the old ordinance we had what we called the ten trip rule. If a development put less than ten trips through a failing corridor or failing intersection, it was exempted from concurrency, it didn't matter, and we had some leakage there. We had developments downsizing to just get under ten and then come in with nine trips through that intersection and they avoid concurrency that way. We're on our second generation now, it's the scale Evan described, small developments are checked out to one mile, medium size two and large three. We still have some leakage, it's what we've been talking about. I'm not sure you can devise a

perfect system with absolutely no leakage at all. With respect to what's going on up in Salmon Creek, we have discussed this issue with the Board of County Commissioners, we've done quick analyses looking at how much traffic is this concept adding, it's a small amount, but the Board has reviewed it and they've directed staff to make no change to the ordinance at this point in time.

BARCA: Okay. So we haven't really looked at the aspect of whether we could have plugged the leak because we've been given direction to not plug the leak?

LOWRY: No. No. We have looked at the, at what could be done to plug the leak and there's essentially two things that could be done. One is to get rid of the mile limitations. In fact perhaps get rid of any distance limitation so long as a trip theoretically gets from a proposed development to a corridor that, you're testing that, that development for concurrency. For any sizable development that probably means that, at least within the Vancouver area, they're going to be tested on every corridor in the Vancouver urban area, that's the downsize, there's no de minimis rule that would apply.

The other way to -- and I think the reason why this loophole is considered unacceptable by a lot of people is that here the developer is actively bringing in only parts of projects at a time and that, we could deal with that, we could adopt a rule that if a piece of property was under contiguous ownership within the last X number of years, then in computing number of trips you'd have to add up any previous development on that historically owned property. One of the problems with that approach is that oftentimes on these larger developments the developer is not the historic owner, he may have blocked up an ownership, which we want to encourage developers to do, and bought from a number of historic owners in order to have the large project. To adopt rules to discourage a developer from doing that has other consequences that are negative. It is in the County's interest to see developments be as broad as possible in terms of trying to get a maximum use of a large conglomeration of property. I think where the Board was, is not able to see a clearly preferred solution that would be able to plug the loophole without having negative unintended consequences.

BARCA: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Just to get back to, I guess all three of the recommendations, and I'd just like to suggest maybe that we take them one at a time if that's okay, I know it's a package, but the staff recommendation to approve the proposed amendment to the arterial atlas I didn't hear any testimony here that was against that and it seems like that that would definitely be a positive step in trying to correct some of the problems that we've been talking about here tonight. And also the second recommendation, the Planning Commission approve the proposed capital facilities plan amendment, goes along with that. And maybe we could discuss those and it seems like the contentious issue that was brought up tonight with quite a bit of testimony involved the third recommendation here that would essentially lower the level-of-service from 22 miles per hour down to 13. Is that correct, Evan? Does that characterize that proposal?

DUST: That is correct.

DELEISSEGUES: So I'd throw that out, maybe if we could discuss the first two and decide what we're going to do there, the third one would fall into place. On the other hand, you could start with the third one and if depending on how you came out with that, the other two might be adjusted. It would seem to me that the level-of-service, I was just doing some math over here, you know, if you went 2 miles an hour or 2.2 through a corridor at 60 miles an hour, you'd get there in about 2 minutes. If you go 30, 4 minutes. If you go 20 miles an hour it's 6. Go down to 10, it's 12. I don't think that a congested corridor, and we've got a number of them in the County, this isn't the only one, and we've had problems with intersections and corridors in a number of areas, we have lowered the level-of-service in certain areas, two things that that triggered, one of them was it certainly went up on the priority list for the County to correct the problem, but the bigger issue was that it went up on the State priority list for the State to come into action and put some of their dollars into helping correct the problem too and this problem in this corridor is bigger than Clark County. I think that we are going to have to have -- as Mr. Schulte might have pointed out, Washington State is going to have to help us correct some of these approach problems from I-5 into this corridor area. I think that sometimes taking the bull by the horn, lowering the level-of-service, admitting, hey, we do have a problem, helps point out the need for the State to reprioritize some of their funding into helping correct that problem.

The other thing is it's a dog chasing its tail right now. You can spiral down by putting in a moratorium and people can't develop their property, people that have \$500,000 invested in some commercial enterprise can't continue on with that, so there's no collection of funds, the tax money goes down, there's less and less capability or ways to fund the projects that need to be funded to correct the problem. I think some of us in other areas, and particularly myself, I've watched problems that were bad be corrected by the County, it's not an impossibility, but it all required money, it all required somebody to fund the projects like Padden Expressway or Parkway and some of the intersection problems we've had on Fourth Plain and certainly on SR-500, and they've gotten better. You know, a lot of people think, well, gee whiz, it couldn't get much worse, but when it did get worse, it immediately got better, and I think sometimes you have to admit that you've got a problem, you've got to deal with that problem until you can develop the funding and the prioritizing and the mechanism to correct the problem or you can live a long time with something that even though we don't lower the level-of-service doesn't mean that the service level's going to get better. We can keep it at 22 and we can have a moratorium, there's going to be more development out there just as you described, by the processes you described, the traffic situation's not going to get better that way I don't think. I think the only way it's going to get better is if we lower the level-of-service, continue with the commercial development, the hospital, the jobs, the kinds of things that produce income, generate the priority need to fix that problem and then I think the County can be in a better position to get on with it.

SCHULTE: Let me make a comment with respect to the three components we're talking about tonight, they're all interrelated. Evan Dust put up a graph during his presentation that showed a curve that ended down at 13.2 miles an hour, that was the 20-year travel speed projection for the corridor ending at 13.2, that was the basis for the 13 mile an hour standard. The travel speeds would always be above the standard that was set. If we didn't do the first and second element, which is the 139th Street overcrossing, the travel speeds would be much lower and the standard would have to

be set lower. So if one and two don't happen, the bar has to go lower, if that makes sense.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, it does.

MOSS: Steve or Evan, if I could ask you to address something, there's been a considerable amount of testimony here tonight to the effect that the moratorium should be left in place until such time as the problem can be corrected and that really development ought to be responsible for paying the cost of that correction. That sounds good in theory, but you folks during the workshop mentioned a figure that I think is pretty intimidating, I'd like to have you address that. If we were to keep the moratorium in place until we could make improvements to this corridor, we could or the State could, that would make it possible to maintain 22 miles per hour out until 2022, how much money would we have to spend?

SCHULTE: No one has ever looked at that extensive a capital program. We have a very extensive capital program that's imbedded in those travel speeds up there, \$80 million is the rough estimate, and you can see the travel speed drops below 22 in the next year or so. So even with \$80 million invested we're still below 22 miles an hour. So we simply -- I don't say at any cost we can't maintain a 22 mile an hour travel speed, but it would be a much higher cost than \$80 million.

LOWRY: I think one of the things along that same line that needs to be kept in mind, you heard testimony that the problem we're experiencing in here may simply be that growth's occurred too fast. If that were in fact the cause of this failure, then from a legal standpoint it would be appropriate to let the moratorium allow County investment to catch up with growth, but staff I think is testifying, technical staff, that the cause of this moratorium isn't growth, it's the basic flawed assumptions and analysis that went into the setting of the level-of-service, that throughout the course of the planning horizon that we will not be able to maintain the 22 mile an hour standard, that they were wrong when they indicated three years ago to the legislative body that this standard meant that the affordable level of -- the affordable capital facilities plan matched the growth assumptions.

MOSS: Yes.

LOWRY: Given that basic inconsistency, the County does not have the legal choice of just leaving the moratorium in place, we have to fix the error in -- what it would take from a capital facilities standpoint to maintain the level-of-service, we have to come up with the additional money to maintain the 22,000 or we have to lower level-of-service, those are the only two practical alternatives that are available to us other than the potential for totally changing the land use designations in this area, which would essentially mean we'd have to upzone other areas of the County, which probably would mean that we're just raising a bunch of new capital facilities issues in other areas. So what I think is important from a legal standpoint, the status quo is not an available option to the County.

MOSS: Rich, I think that was very helpful to your comments, I thank you for them to put this in perspective. To me we have a situation where there, we have no ability to

spend our way out of this or to buy our way out of this problem, we can by 22 miles per hour continued service in this corridor, that seems like a given to me.

SCHULTE: And I think this, the figure, validates that statement.

MOSS: So we do have to decide what's an affordable program and then match our level-of-service to that accordingly or take one of these other measures, Rich, that you mentioned such as downzoning the whole area and putting that anticipated development elsewhere in the County and then face up to what that means there.

LOWRY: Right. And but you've heard a lot of testimony that there are other tools that you ought to be using in conjunction with the lowering of level-of-service if that's what you do such as an allocation. That is a -- those are legitimate options that are available to the County and whether the timing is right to consider them now as opposed to it as a part of the update that will be coming before this Commission later this year probably is ultimately a question that will be answered by the Board of Commissioners.

BARCA: I do think it's a great timing in regard to that, though, as we've heard a lot of testimony to say that this is the first of the potential many places that we're going to see this starting to crop up, especially as we do continue to densify in some urban locations. We have an opportunity to utilize some tools that we haven't chosen to use in the past. I think we had a lot of people say that they wanted to hold the line on where the level-of-service was supposed to be, they were really asking for that 22 mile per hour limit, not so much because that was a good boundary, but I believe it has a lot to do with there was a certain amount of public trust in the idea that their quality of life should be maintained by the comprehensive plan and the capital facilities plan that follows suit with it, that they dovetail together, so the neighborhoods of the area and the local businesses don't have to suffer for the sake of continuing to be able to do business, but what we're seeing here is obviously that 22 miles per hour is not realistic, we can't spend our way out of it, but then again talking about going immediately to 13 miles per hour, which is that's the horizon out at 2022 on the 20-year plan, why do we pick the end target right up front and just throw that out there as the tool. I would much prefer to see us start to have good faith in the aspect of the neighborhoods and for Ms. is it Edwards?

EDWARDS: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Ms. Edwards who came forward and said here she's precluded from being able to genuinely build in an industrial development which talks about jobs in the way that we try and talk about, yet we have 1,000 houses that are going to be able to continue to leak through the institutionalized loophole that's in place. Good faith says that we turn that around. I think the allocation of capacity for the sake of job business development is this wholly appropriate and I think looking at a level-of-service somewhere higher than 13 miles per hour is wholly appropriate too even if that meant we incrementally stepped down at periods of time and continued to review what we're allocating for and whether we're getting our value out of that allocation I think is our first opportunity to start doing these impacted corridors in a new way, regionally plan them but locally manage them I think is where we really need to be. This area suffered from

the regional goals and now it has to be planned in a subregional area.

DELEISSEGUES: Rich, a question. If we allocated capacity and we started with let's say the hospital, I don't know if you can do it that way or by classification, industrial and then down to commercial, and let's say at that point you ran out of capacity, would that disallow the residential development?

LOWRY: Yeah, the current code authorizes the Board to reserve or allocate capacity either to a specific proposed development, and in the case of the hospital there's actually a -- well, we've already had an initial public hearing, and it's coming on again in a couple of weeks, for a proposed development agreement that would allocate capacity to the hospital or to, the Board could also, can also allocate generically to a preferred land use so that the tool box or the, already contains the ability of the Board to legislatively allocate available capacity and that could occur in conjunction with an action in lowering the level-of-service to allocate some portion of that to a particular land use.

But part of what's going on now with the update is a determination as to, well, very much of a focus is public investment in infrastructure for industry, that's probably the hot button today in terms of the comp plan update. The Board is struggling now with the cities to try to figure out where it makes the most sense to do that. We've all heard about Discovery corridor and there are half a dozen competing potential areas for that.

I think it probably highly likely that as that planning effort evolves, and it's going to evolve fast because our, it's scheduled to be completed this year, that there will be reservations of capacity to industry to go along with the focused public investment in those areas. I'm not -- and to me a timing issue is presented about whether it makes sense to reserve capacity without the industrial plan in place. I don't know how you go about doing it. Karpinski said 80 percent, I don't know what that's based on.

DELEISSEGUES: I just wondered if that would be a mechanism, if the capacity were allocated, to prevent the loophole that Ron's talking about or does the development under a certain number don't count at all in the allocation in capacity?

LOWRY: It would not help the loophole. The loophole allows avoidance of concurrency in testing altogether.

BARCA: But we could do away with the loophole, couldn't we?

LOWRY: Yes. Again, there are issues of doing it in a way that you, that the benefits outweigh the unintended consequences.

BARCA: I guess that's where I get back to the subarea planning.

MOSS: But the loophole is only relevant to any discussion that includes an assumption that the moratorium will stay in place.

LOWRY: Or that you're not in de facto moratorium.

MOSS: Or that you're not in de facto moratorium, right. Either legal or de facto, right.

LEIN: Mr. Schulte, you indicated that the impact of these homes was minimal when you were earlier doing them. Can you give me a better idea of the figure?

SCHULTE: I can't recall the exact percentage, I believe it was less than ten percent.

LEIN: Less than ten?

SCHULTE: If you added up all of the residential units that are coming in that we had on our radar screen six months ago, it would be less than ten percent of the total traffic going through the very congested part of the corridor.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

SMITH: In looking at that curve we see spikes every place we have some road improvement. Is that telling me that the 13 years from 2011 to 2022 we don't anticipate any more improvements in the road system?

DUST: We don't have any scheduled improvements that are on the capital facilities plan that would affect this corridor in that time frame. There may be other improvements that would affect the travel speed that are sort of outside the modeling on a regional basis. If you build a 219th do you end up getting more traffic from Battle Ground that doesn't use this corridor because it's now fully satisfied by 219th. That is one of the challenges, by the way, of if you just leave the moratorium in place that traffic will get worse on the corridor because there's lots of places that are outside our land use jurisdiction that can develop and that can add traffic onto the corridor.

SMITH: As far as priority for funding, are you a higher priority if you're failing or whether you're meeting a lowered standard?

SCHULTE: In our capital prioritizing scheme for that we use in our six-year transportation improvement program one criteria is concurrency status. And it's true if a corridor is in failure it gets more points, it would get a higher priority than a corridor that's not.

SMITH: So actually by lowering it to 13 miles an hour we're lowering the priority for getting it fixed?

SCHULTE: Excuse me?

SMITH: So then by lowering it to 13 miles an hour, we're lowering it as a priority for a fix?

SCHULTE: Correct, it would not rank as high.

LOWRY: But that's on, you know, number one, that's on the County system. Number two, these improvements are already top priority and they're not going to change from being top priority to the extent that they're under County control.

SMITH: Oh, okay. So 139th is top priority. Even though it's way down that list that's not necessarily a priority list where you replace 154th?

SCHULTE: The 139th Street overcrossing project right now is slated to be completed about six years out.

SMITH: That's pretty quick for a County.

SCHULTE: The first up movement -- well, the first County project is the Highway 99 realignment project. It's a little bit of a down movement and what's happening right there is that project adds a lot of, has mobility benefit in the north/south direction, it's a key component to later improvements, but it hurts us a little bit in east/west travel speed on the failing corridor. We have -- that project's largely grant funded so we want to move it ahead because it will have long-term benefit. The second one is the 139th Street overcrossing project and that gives us a couple miles an hour of gain. And then finally the I-5 diamond at 134th Street gives us a two to three miles an hour gain. It's interesting if you look at the shape of the curve, as we go further out in time the curve flattens out and what that's telling us is that the traffic's getting better distributed in the area, everything is easing a bit, the growth rates are being held the same, but circulation is working like it should and traffic is spreading out.

MOSS: People are finding alternate corridors.

SCHULTE: Correct.

SMITH: And why did we choose three percent as opposed to a percent and a half?

SCHULTE: What we wanted to do was bracket the recent history. If you look back about five years prior to the moratorium occurring, we saw actual traffic growth, not population growth but traffic growth, on the corridor of one and a half to three percent, so that kind of bounds the historical numbers and so we wanted to look at each out into the future.

SMITH: So we're looking at the worse case scenario here too, then, as far as at least within the brackets, we're not looking at one and a half obviously, we're using the 13.2 as opposed to what looks like a little over 15 at one and a half?

SCHULTE: It's speculation on what a worse case scenario is. I've heard comment that if the moratorium were to come off, a lot of new development would rush in and it might be considerably more than three percent. There's also a funneling effect, development from outside the area could funnel through the corridor and that could increase your percentage. Again, these are historically driven back five years, projected out 20.

SMITH: One other thing that WSDOT is concerned about, the reduction may cause backups into the Interstate ramps. Do you think that's a reasonable concern?

SCHULTE: It is a very legitimate concern. With respect to the Legacy proposal that we're negotiating right now, Legacy's looking at doing mitigation on that northbound

off-ramp so that the partnership we're putting together with Legacy is concerned about minimizing the backups down onto the mainline. What we would work with on each future development if this proposed action does occur and the standard is lowered, we would attempt to deal with those mainline safety issues.

MOSS: Is that northbound off-ramp on 205 or I-5?

SCHULTE: At 134th right now, but at some point in the future the 205 north --

MOSS: I-5?

SCHULTE: Right, it's the I-5/134th Street northbound off-ramp. At some point in the future the 205 northbound off-ramp might also need some relief with respect to mainline backups.

SMITH: Would those release add into more spikes on this curve?

BARCA: They're already accounted for.

SCHULTE: The 134th Street, I-5 improvements are the 2011, the 205 ramps are not included there, they don't have -- they don't seem to have a big travel speed impact on the corridor.

SMITH: Just safety.

RUPLEY: Steve, I want to go a little bit further with this WSDOT memo. It looks like they're walking away from any kind of funding currently at this point in their memo too and so I don't know that other people have seen that, but they indicated there's no funding for them to look at safety improvements, but they mention that 134th off of I-5 is a high accident location and I'm going to kind of go back along the line of do they have priorities that they have to meet when they have designations like this and do we want to make that worse for them to get funding sooner?

SCHULTE: I think they do have priorities. The problem is they can't fund the improvements, they don't have the funding ability. And the issue here is do County developments receive denials because the State can't fund their improvements and we're somewhat in untested waters here.

LOWRY: Well, not totally untested, it is clear --

RUPLEY: I knew there would be an answer.

LOWRY: -- that the State law was amended, oh, five, six years ago to provide that local government did not have the ability to turn down a development based upon concurrency concerns on what are called highways of statewide significance, which at least I-5 is, and --

SCHULTE: And 205 too.

LOWRY: -- 205. So we could not turn down a development because of congestion on either of those routes, including congestion caused by backups; however, we have historically, and I think correctly, treated safety issues as something entirely different than concurrency issues and have denied developments that substantially aggravated or caused a safety issue on a State facility even when we couldn't measure for concurrency unless the developer mitigated that issue.

SCHULTE: It's an interesting challenge, the I-5 northbound off-ramp at 134th has been in failure, that ramp signal has been in failure for a number of years now, under the old program, under our current program it's probably in failure, but we can't test it under State law. So the challenge for us is if it's failing and if it's the root cause of the backup down on to the mainline can we deny due to a safety problem or are we obligated to deny, even if the root causes concurrency that the County can't touch what obligations do we have with respect to safety. We have been working with the State trying to iron out just what our authorities and obligations are under that scenario.

RUPLEY: Okay, that's it for this time. I have others but --

DELEISSEGUES: So back to the corridor. What are the pros and cons of lowering the level-of-service in your mind? You know what, why staff's recommending that we lower them, but I haven't really heard any real defense of that in terms of what we're gaining and what we're giving up if we do and if we don't.

SCHULTE: Well, certainly if the standard is not lowered the area will stay in either formal moratorium or de facto moratorium, the chart shows that, and then you're into long-term moratorium, then you're into property devaluation issues, takings issues, Rich can address those better than I can, but certainly there's long-term land use impacts if the whole area, if there can be no development in the greater Salmon Creek area for the next 20 years and I can't even begin to speculate about what those impacts would be. A pro for lowering the standard is it is going to allow development to come in that we can probably possibly partner with to make some of these improvements happen. And if the capital improvements are happening, then we get some other benefits other than just travel speed on that east/west corridor, there may be some north/south benefits, there may be some pedestrian benefits. One thing we've been focusing on is one linear corridor, that's it, an east/west corridor, there are other transportation related benefits that we'd like to see in Salmon Creek that would be, could be benefited if we have a thriving community out there that's growing because then they -- the County could partner with them to help make some of these improvements.

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks.

BARCA: If we lower the level-of-service to 13 miles per hour do we really have to spend any money at all for any capital improvement?

SCHULTE: If you, yeah, that travel speed curve would be much lower without those, with those improvements. And again, the rate of decline -- again the curve is flattening, the rate of decline would be very steep and at some point possibly '07 to '12 we can't even get the models to work, we can't even get traffic to move, the models fail, so we

really don't know what happens when we get there.

BARCA: So it doesn't fail until you just said '07 or something like that?

SCHULTE: I think somewhere between '07 and '12 is when we looked at scenarios with no capital improvements, we simply can't get traffic to move, we can't get a model to run to show us what travel speeds will be, it's that congested, things just shut down.

BARCA: So it must go below 13 miles per hour much earlier than that then?

SCHULTE: Correct. The rate of descent would continue to be very steep without any capital improvements.

BARCA: But wouldn't the same Laws of Nature that we've been talking about kick in earlier where people would find alternate routes and the pressure would relieve itself to a certain degree?

SCHULTE: To some degree it would. But one of the problems up there, there are not a lot of alternative routes. If you're going up -- if you're going to WSU or north of WSU, you generally have to get off at 134th. The fundamental problem there is you've got two Interstates coming together, we have two interchanges with the local road system with the Interstates, they're right next to each other, we've got two major intersections between those interchanges, there's just too much jammed into a short space. All of the area feeds through there. The WSU traffic going to I-5 southbound goes through there, north of WSU goes through there, the Sky View traffic going to 205 Vancouver Mall goes through there, everyone is funneled through that area and it's real challenging.

BARCA: So if we go ahead and lower the level-of-service and get ourselves out of moratorium, we no longer trigger concurrency for a certain length of time, we're taking a lot of pressure off of whatever development jumps in in the initial time frame that that's available, but we don't really have a good handle on what kind of development that's going to be at this moment, do we?

DUST: I think the indications we have from pre-application conference submittals is that the majority of development that's seeking to file applications in the near-term is residential; however, there's only so much land zoned for residential, there's only so much land zoned for commercial and industrial that depends upon this corridor. Ultimately your allocation plan is your land use plan. If you allocate a lot of land for residential development and then suddenly you say, oh, look, we're getting a lot of residential development that wants to use this corridor, what portion of that equation isn't absolutely true. If the land use plan has a lot of residential land in it versus commercial land and industrial land, why are we surprised that we get a lot of residential applications to use the capacity.

BARCA: That was the point I was really trying to get at, unfortunately I think where we are already at in the land use plan, by the time we have an opportunity to review the comp plan and forward any changes to the Board of Commissioners, and by the time that's already approved, there's an opportunity for what residential land is out there to

become vested to a great degree and then my concern comes back to the aspect of what limited capacity is going to become available that we're expecting to genuinely be in play for this period of time, certainly not up to the 20-year plan, but say for the next 10 years where we're actually showing capital investment is going to become rapidly consumed without it benefiting us in the method that we hoped would be in place. I'm almost reluctant to say that it's appropriate to get that level-of-service lowered to that degree because of the triggering while we do have an opportunity to evaluate the area in our comp plan review, I'm more inclined to look at the aspect of an incremental lowering of the level-of-service to open up the opportunity for some development and certainly to benefit businesses such as Ms. Edwards who's waiting for an opportunity to legally get back in the game, but not to swing open the entire 20-year inventory for first come, first serve grabbing. Can we entertain the aspect of something different than the 13 mile per hour?

LOWRY: Yes. I mean -- and that could be a strategy, for example, to even out growth, to guard against premature growth, to not have everything. I guess my concern is the County hasn't done that before. I'm not sure that you have a great basis in this record to decide on what an interim step would be, but given the fact that all this is going to be back before you in a few months again with the plan update, I don't know that it -- I'm not particularly concerned from a legal standpoint if you were to decide to pick an interim number.

DELEISSEGUES: But it wouldn't really matter, would it, I mean, if we're going to lower it? What you're really doing is you're allowing the opportunity for the commercial development and so forth to come in that can partner with the County to help pay for some of the improvements. Whether we lower it or not or to what number we lower it, the residential still comes in which doesn't help pay for much, it doesn't solve the problem.

LOWRY: Yeah, one comment in terms of partnering, our major partnering technique in the County is impact fees. The issue that we had with the East County development that's called Pipeline One I don't think any of us want to go through again. The primary way that -- I mean if there is something that isn't right about the system because we're not getting fair share from developers, the way to correct that in my view is to go back into our impact fee program and make sure it does allocate the right split between public and private. One of the primary limitations that we have today on impact fees is under State law you can't charge more than fair, than a fair share to the private side, the public has to pick up existing deficiencies, and so every project has a public share and a private share. One of the -- and you'll recall this from when the impact fee update occurred, one of the biggest brakes on increase in impact fees is the public can't afford the public share.

SMITH: On that curve again, the three percent, is that based a constant three percent every year or what might more realistically happen is we may get four or five percent for the first ten years and maybe a percent and a half when this area is becoming all filled in?

SCHULTE: It was a constant rate compounded.

SMITH: So that might not be realistic?

SCHULTE: Correct. I'm sure growth occurs in spurts and plateaus.

SMITH: More likely more of that growth is going to happen in the first ten years which would bring that graph down a lot sooner than it shows there I would think.

RUPLEY: We're looking for reasons for a tiered approach. You can see where we're going.

MOSS: Well, one of the things that I can assure you that will happen is if you consider -- if you're worried about a burst of project applications coming in, the way that you can ensure that is take this incremental approach, because what you do is you open the door a little bit, you're going to have everybody out there competing for that same little bit and people who are -- might reasonably wait an extended period of time to develop their property are going to be looking to develop it while the door is open. That's just the nature of development.

SCHULTE: An observation about a tiered approach is when developers are faced with that situation, concurrency uncertainty, development uncertainty, the smaller more nimble residential developments that can move quickly, get all permits in a year, they seem to be able to move through the system and get permits. The larger employers, the industrial, possibly family wage employers, commercial that have longer lead times can't take that risk on and so they don't seem to come in. So the observation is a tiered approach might inadvertently generate more residential applications than others.

MOSS: I would suspect that that would be the case.

RUPLEY: That's interesting.

LEIN: Other questions of staff?

MOSS: So that we're clear, getting back to the issue of priority setting for improvements, those improvements on that the State would be making, this priority is not, their priority is not affected by whether or not we're meeting our concurrency goals or whether this is at failure of those concurrency goals, they're set merely by the problems that are caused on the State highway or the Interstate and its off-ramps?

SCHULTE: Well, and I think they're related to the action you could take tonight. If you took no action tonight and the County did not drop the level-of-service standard and the area went into a 20-year moratorium with no growth, the State might not fund their improvements soon out here because there would be no need to. Conversely, if the standard did drop and went to 13 miles an hour and growth restarted out there, the State would become concerned about mainline safety and backups and things like that and that might push the State to get these particular projects funded earlier.

RUPLEY: So there is a way to go up the priority list of the State then?

SCHULTE: And it's based on need.

SMITH: Deaths.

RUPLEY: Deaths.

SCHULTE: Well, I think that the State is very concerned about mainline backups. When the I-5 northbound off-ramp that traffic encroaches down on a curve on to the mainline of I-5, they monitor that very closely and that does move their projects up in priority.

MOSS: And that is a serious safety issue, particularly with the evening peak hour in the wintertime when it's dark at that time.

SMITH: Foggy mornings, yeah.

MOSS: Inclement weather, right.

LEIN: Other comments?

RUPLEY: Can we just discuss until the lights go out and then run.

LEIN: No. No. Do I hear any motions?

DELEISSEGUES: Just a question: How do we want to deal with this? Do we want to take these one at a time and make a motion on all three of them at the same time or what? Any comment on that?

LEIN: Is there any consensus as far as --

MOSS: I'm ready for one vote.

LEIN: One vote. Carey.

SMITH: Sure.

LEIN: One vote?

RUPLEY: Yes.

LEIN: Okay, it sounds like one vote.

SMITH: Does that mean everyone, if we're talking one vote I think the first two are a no brainer and that would mean everyone agrees that the third one would be voted the same way?

RUPLEY: Well, Steve said that they were interconnected and so our easy way out is taking the two no brainers and skipping on the third I don't think we're going to get to do so.

BARCA: But this is just going to be an up or down recommendation, approval or denial?

SMITH: If you vote "no" on Number 3 but you may vote "yes" on 1 and 2 but that vote's never registered.

LEIN: There's two ways we can handle it. One we can vote on each issue. The second we can give your feelings that will be forwarded on to the Board of County Commissioners that you support the first two and you don't support this part of the third one, so we still get that as a matter of record to the Commissioners and I think that's the important part is for them to hear those.

MOSS: No, I think another important part of this discussion has to be recognition that there's little point in making either the arterial atlas amendment or the change to the capital facilities plan because that improvement isn't likely to happen if it won't result in any change in the moratorium status on the 134th Street corridor, that's why I don't, I don't see much point in separating these out. It's kind of an exercise in futility to vote for the first two and then --

LEIN: Vote "no" on the last one.

MOSS: -- vote "no" for the third one.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that's why I brought that up. I concur, I'd like to see one vote.

BARCA: It's all the same to me.

LEIN: Do you want to start with a motion?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure. I'd like to make a **MOTION** the Planning Commission pass on to the Board of County Commissioners our recommendation to **APPROVE** the three amendments, amendment to the county atlas, amendment to the affordable transportation capital facility plan, and the amendment to Table 12.41.080, Clark County Code 12.41 transportation concurrency management system.

LEIN: Is there a second to the motion?

MOSS: **Second.**

LEIN: Any discussion or comments before we vote?

SMITH: Well, I guess I read through this stuff beforehand and listened to the testimony and was convinced, you know, it just goes against my better judgment to set a standard and then decide I can't make the standard so we use something else, but this conversation here toward the end, it, although it still goes against my grain, it just makes all kinds of sense to go this way. I think we'll get a fix sooner even though it -- I think I'm convinced we will get a fix sooner by doing, going this route even though it seems like doing it just the opposite way that, it seems backwards to me, but I'm convinced it's probably the best way to go so.

BARCA: And I guess I would like to say for my comments prior to the vote that for the Board of County Commissioners to have a very low population target and put jobs, jobs, jobs as our priority through the State of the County address, it was reiterated once again this proposal does nothing towards forwarding the goals of the County for the next 20 years. In my estimation there was a lot of tools that were left on the table that staff could have brought forward. Perhaps their instructions were to get this corridor open and running and this is the most expedient way to do that, but I believe it's shortsighted in regards to the long-term goals for the County, and rather than move forward with our objectives we will be impeded by this and it won't be very long down the road that that will happen. And I'm ready for the vote.

DELEISSEGUES: I guess I'd just like to say I'd like to recommend to look at even if the vote is approved the allocation plan and some of the other mechanisms that were discussed tonight in the testimony. I think they were all good suggestions, hopefully the staff would continue to look at that and implement the best of those.

SMITH: Have we thought about even just running out a little further east before he starts the stopwatch and then they wouldn't have any problem at all out there.

RUPLEY: And, Evan, we'll wait while you go do that right now.

LEIN: Go ahead.

RUPLEY: I just -- this is one of the hardest votes that I've ever had to look at because I just like it's not part of what we need to be looking at and I hope that we do look at other tools in the future. Allocation plans look good. I appreciate the testimony, I think it was incredible, the research and the things that the neighborhoods did and the people said. And so, anyway.

LEIN: I would say that the insight at the end from Mr. Schulte and Rich helped make it an easier decision. You know, having the ability to understand the impact of doing nothing means a lot because if you don't understand that, the choice is fairly easy, you know, you say we'll deny it and we'll just stay on, and I'm sure the people that are impacted by it, the neighborhood commission groups here, hopefully will find that as we go forward in the next year and this continues to be studied, not only here but I think countywide, that we're going to see an impact on a growing community. I think the three percent may be high, especially with the sort of the mandate from the Commissioners as a lower growth. I agree with Ron that the priorities should be the job issue. If we're going to make this a viable community, if we don't have the jobs that can support the infrastructure and the services that are provided, we're going to be really a poor sub-cousin to some other jurisdiction. So I would support the motion.

RUPLEY: Steve, I wanted to tell you thank you too, I think that your -- I mean we were headed in a wrong direction and I think that you were really clear about what kinds of things our actions were going to do.

SCHULTE: Let me just make a comment. In concurrency we have 34 corridors that are really in pretty good shape, we have one corridor, this corridor, where we do

believe the standard wasn't properly set due to some modeling problems, but the other 33 corridors are in good shape, the standard appears to be appropriate, they're in and out of what we call short-term failure, they need a turn lane, it happens, it's a developer agrees to do it, it needs a signal, it's not a highly visible thing when it happens, but the standards appear to be proper. This corridor is very different. The modeling, the models didn't work on this corridor due to the close intersection spacing and really we're -- tonight what we're trying to do is solve a modeling problem.

LEIN: Any other comments? Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| MOSS: | AYE |
| BARCA: | NO |
| SMITH: | AYE |
| RUPLEY: | AYE |
| DELEISSEGUES: | AYE |
| LEIN: | AYE |

LEIN: Be forwarded on to the Board of County Commissioners for their action at a date to be set later. That concludes tonight's public hearing items. Thank you, public, for your testimony and sticking around to listen to the debate, that will go on forward to the Board of County Commissioners.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DELEISSEGUES: Just a question: When's our next workshop and/or public hearing?

BARCA: March 20th.

DELEISSEGUES: Do we got a date?

MOSS: A month from tonight.

WISER: Let's see, March --

DUST: March 17th. I believe we have a public hearing only in the month of March.

DELEISSEGUES: I have it on the 20th.

LEIN: It's March 20 would be our standard.

WISER: March 20th, the third Thursday, here.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

MOSS: Here?

WISER: Here.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 9:30 p.m. All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed at Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning.

Vaughn Lein, Chairman

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

Sw\min 02-20-2003